UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/500,315	06/28/2004	Shichao Ge	4582-008 9868		
22429 7590 04/18/2007 LOWE HAUPTMAN BERNER, LLP 1700 DIAGONAL ROAD			EXAMINER		
			SEMBER, THOMAS M		
SUITE 300 ALEXANDRI	Δ VΔ 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ALEXANDIG	11, VII 22311		2885		
			D	DEL IVERY MODE	
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/18/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	Z /	~
_		_

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/500,315	GE, SHICHAO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Thomas M. Sember	2885		

	Thomas M. Sember	2885	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date 	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed in the propos	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re corresponding number of finally rej	TE below);	·
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.14. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	•	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-16. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	⊠ will not be entered, or b) □ wi vided below or appended.	Il be entered and an e	explanation of
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(Is to provide a I).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 		n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	Oh hah	/.
	•	Thomas M Sember	

Thomas M Sember Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2885 Continuation of 3. NOTE: In an attempt to correct the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, the applicant further broadened applicant's claim 1 so that "the circuit board is only provided on or around base" not "where the base is mountly directly on a circuit board." This new broader claimed limitation would require a further update and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that AAPA fails to disclose the details of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9, the examiner disagrees. As broadly claimed, AAPA discloses "At least one LED chip (101, Fig. 1) directly mounted on a metal base of high heat conductivity (103, Fig. 1). Wherein the LED chip is electrically connected to an applied power supply/driving circuit through the CB (107) via outgoing LED leads (105). Wherein the LED has a transparent medium layer/bulb housing/optical glue and lens disposed thereon (108/109). Wherein the CB 107 is provided on or around the base 103. Furthermore, applicant further argues that the 35 U.S.C. rejection of AAPA in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0071275 to Worgan et al. ("Worgan"), U.S. Patent No. 6,220,722 to Begemann, U.S. Patent No. 6,505,301 to Lowery, U.S. Patent No. 6,827,470 to Sagal et al. ("Sagal"), and U.S. Patent No. 3,936,686 to Moore fails to teach applicant's claimed invention by pointing out features claimed in independent claim 1. AAPA was combined with the secondary references for AAPA's failure to teach other claimed features not the features of claim 1.

THOMAS M SEMBER
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER